

A N
A N S W E R
T O T H E

Athenian Mercury,

VOL. 4. NUMB. 14.

CONCERNING

INFANT-BAPTISM.

With an Account of divers

Q U E R I E S

Sent by the Author (and some others) to the

Athenian Society,

Which they have not yet answered.

To which are added, some REMARKS by way of
Reply to their *Mercury* on the same Subject,
Num. 18. published Novemb. 28.

London, Printed for the Author, and sold by John Harris at
the Harrow in the Poultry. MDCXCI.

A N
 A N S W E R
 TO THE
 ATHENIAN MERCURY,
 VOL. 4. NUMB. 14.
 CONCERNING
 INFANT-BAPTISM.

With an Account of divers Questions sent by the Author (and
 some others) to the *Athenian Society*, which they
 have not yet answered.

Gentlemen,

WH O he was that sent you the first Questions about Infant-Baptism, I know not; whether he was an Antipedo-Baptist, or a Pedo-Baptist is a Question: but your calling upon all who had any Doubts about it, to send in their Objections, argues a great degree of Confidence of your Ability, of doing more than all before: For 'tis strange you should attempt to call for all our Objections, when it appears you intended to write but one half Sheet of Paper in Answer to them; as if you could do that in a few Lines, which others, as learned as yourselves, could never yet do in great Volumes; thus

favours (as some judge) of great Pride, and casts much Contempt upon you, and lessens your Reputation among wise Men who are for Pedo Baptism, as well as others. And yet after all the great and mighty noise, you have not so much as in the least touched the chief Questions, which, so my knowledge, were sent you near a Fortnight before your said *Mercury* came forth. And therefore to shew how disingenuous you have been herein, I thought it might not be amiss to spend two or three spare hours upon your *Mercury*.

1. The first Question you pretend to answer is this, *i. e.* Whether Baptism (as it is commonly

commonly taught) is the proper and natural Antitype of Circumcision?

Reply. As to what you speak of the Customs of Nations, Linguisms, and of Men being ignorant of Radixes, or Original Significations in Languages, seems remote to the business, and serves for little else than to blot Paper, or rather to darken Counsel: Certainly the Ordinance of Baptism, one of the two great Sacraments of the New-Testament, doth not lie so obscure in God's Word, either what it is, or who are the proper Subjects thereof, that Men must be at a loss about it, unless they understand the Radixes, or original Significations of Languages. But to proceed, you would, it seems, have Baptism to be the proper Antitype of Circumcision in some respect and not in others.

First, From the Customs of the Jews in proselyting the Gentiles into their Religion: so far you say indeed Circumcision was not a Type, but a continuance of a Custom. Now how absurd and ridiculous that is which you affirm upon this account, may appear to all. Will you assert and stand by it, that Baptism was a Jewish Custom, and so no pure Gospel-Institution? Doubtless, if so, the Pharisees might have soon given our Saviour a ready Answer to his great Question, *viz. The Baptism of John, whether is it from Heaven, or of Men?* Mat. 21. 25. Certainly there was no Baptism of this nature of Divine Institution, before John received it from Heaven: But, say you, *If John Baptiz'd undertook any new way of proselyting the Jews into the Gospel, they had not only struggled with the Opposition of his new Doctrine, but also of his new Practice; therefore (say you) it was that this Custom was continued, and had the Super-addition of the full force of Baptism, viz. a Consecration or Seal of the Covenant.*

Reply. As you confess his Doctrine was new, so was his Baptism no doubt; for, as our Annotators observe, his Baptism was part of his Doctrine. Pray, what was the Doctrine he preach'd? was it not Baptism of Repentance for the Remission of Sins? *Mark* 1. 4. Moreover, we do not read they

were more displeased with his new Doctrine than with his new Practice.

2. But what Authority have you to affirm, Gospel-Baptism was but the continuance of a Jewish Custom, or was a Legal Rite, or rather indeed a human Tradition? for 'tis evident the Jews were not required, or commanded of God to baptize their Proselytes, or others; for Circumcision was the only Rite by which Proselytes (who were Males) were added to the Jewish Church, as we find God commanded Abraham. And if Baptism had been so frequently practised amongst the Jews, as you assert, wherefore did the Pharisees say to John, *Why dost thou baptize, if thou art not that Christ, nor Elias?* John 1. 25. Moreover, Baptism is directly called a Principle of the Doctrine of Christ, *Heb.* 6. 1, 2. which Doctrine our Saviour saith he received from his Father. If it be a Principle of the Doctrine of Christ, it follows undeniably, he instituted it, and gave it forth. Furthermore, if Baptism was practised all along among the Jews, I argue, either they practised it as a Mosaic Rite, or else as a Tradition of their sages; not, say I, as a Mosaic Rite, because *Moses* never commanded them so to do; for he speaks nothing of it, and yet declared all things God commanded him; and did every thing according to the Pattern shewed him in the Mount. And if it was a human Jewish Tradition, what is become of one of the great Sacraments of the New Testament? Must it be look'd upon from henceforth to be nothing else than the continuance of a Jewish Tradition taken out of their fabulous and erroneous *Talmud*? What kind of poisonous Stuff is this you trouble the World with? What tho the Jews, who had made the Commandments of God void through their Traditions, did practise some such thing; Must you affirm Gospel-Baptism in its Rite and Original sprung from their Custom? And because they baptized Proselytes both Men, Women and Children, must Christians do so too? Sure the Custom of the Romish Church in baptizing of Infants, as a human Tradition, is every way of as good Authority

Authority to warrant us so to do, as the Custom of the unbelieving Jews. But pray take what a Learned Pedit-Baptist, and a Son of the Church of England, hath said in answer to this vain Conceit; 'tis Sir Norris Knatchbull, in his *Animadversions in lib. Novi Testamenti*, pag. 313. 'As cum videmus summi iudicii viros in his temporibus & Rabbis fundamētis perire veritate, &c. But when I see in these times some Men of the greatest Judgment to fetch the Foundation of Truth from the Rabbins, I cannot but stick at it: for whence was the *Talmud* sent to us, (they are the words (saith he) of Baxter in his *Synagoga Judicia*) that we should give so much Credit thereto, that we should believe that the Mosaic Law either was or ought to be understood therefrom, much less the Gospel, to which they are professed Enemies? The *Talmud* is called a Labyrinth of Errors, and the foundation of Jewish Fables; it was perfected and acknowledged for Authentick five hundred Years after Christ, and out of it *Maimonides* drew his Doctrine, ~~and~~ the rest of them; therefore we cannot acquiesce in such Testimony—Gentlemen, either answer no more Questions about Religion, or take more heed to what you say: for your pleading for Infant-Baptism, from such grounds, all may perceive tends to cast an Odium and Contempt on the Christian Religion: Therefore I infer, your Proof for this Practice from the Custom amongst the Jews about baptizing of Proselytes both Men, Women and Children, proves nothing; you were better, for the Authority of us, to urge the Decrees of Popes and General Councils; a Popish Innovation is as good as a Jewish one.

But however, you do allow that our blessed Saviour did add something to this pretended Jewish Custom, and ~~with~~ not only put it in full force, but also made it a Consecration or Seal of the Covenant; and this, say you, is further strengthened by several undeniable Texts of Scripture, which Anabaptists themselves can never get clear of, and ask them, they must either dissent, or give such a Paraphrase as we do. The

Texts are these: First, Col. 2. 11, 12. *Ad quem alio ut est circumcised with the Circumcision made without hands, in putting off the Body of the Sins of the Flesh, by the Circumcision of Christ. Buried with him in Baptism, &c.* The second, that of baptizing the *Israelites* in the Red-Sea, 1 Cor. 10. 2. The last is the saving of Noah and his Family in the Ark, 1 Pet. 3. 21.

Reply 1. But is it so indeed? did our Saviour in instituting Gospel-Baptism do no more than put a Jewish Custom to be in full force, and make it a Consecration or Seal of the Covenant? Were you not learned and ingenious Men, I should not so much admire at your Notions.

2. But the Truth is, in the second place, if you had not told us in your next words, to what purpose you mention those Scriptures, we should have been at a great loss about it, or not well have understood your Intention; but you, like the ingenious Painter, soon inform us, and tell us what 'tis—i. e. you tell us, you urge not these things to prove any thing else, but the Parallel between Circumcision and Baptism, or to speak (say you) more properly, the necessary continuance of the old Manner amongst the Jews of continuing their way of proselyting the Heathen.

3. Was it necessary then, that a human Tradition of the Jews should be continued? I thought the Apostle tells you that Christ nailed all the Jewish Ceremonies of the Mosaic Law to the Cross, and that they all ceased when the Antitype was come; and before had the Baptism you speak of been indeed a Mosaic Rite, I mean appointed or commanded of God, it had vanished with its Fellows: But 'tis hard Christ should abolish all Legal Customs, or Ceremonial Ordinances, and yet confirm, with some addition, a Custom of the Jews own inventing.

4. You do not seem to distinguish between your twofold Answer to the Question; I thought you had brought those Scriptures to prove Baptism the proper Antitype of Circumcision; but you urge the former old

Custom again, so that here's no Scripture nor Argument brought by you to prove the thing in hand. As touching what you say of the Parallel betwixt Circumcision and Baptism signifies nothing; if in some things there should be a Parallel, it doth not follow therefore Baptism was the Antitype of Circumcision. What tho Circumcision was the initiating Ordinance of the Male Children into the Jewish Church, and Baptism is that initiating Ordinance into the Gospel-Church; this doth not prove the one the Type of the other.

5. But pray, what is it that the Anabaptists can never get clear of, or being ask'd the Exposition, they must be silent, or give such a Paraphrase as you do? I must tell you, I know no Text more full for our practice of baptizing Believers, than that in *Col. 2. 11, 12.* We say from thence, that the proper Antitype of Circumcision in the Flesh, is the Circumcision of the Heart; and therefore not Baptism; tho 'tis granted by us, that in Baptism there is a Representation of the new Birth, and Mortification of Sin, which Circumcision was the expresse Type of: And this cannot weaken nor silence us, but rather strengthen our hands. All that can well be inferred from this Text, *Col. 2. 11, 12.* where the Apostle mentions Circumcision and Baptism, is no more than this, *viz.* where Baptism is administred upon a proper Subject, it represents the Spiritual and Mystical Circumcision of the Heart, *i. e.* that the Soul is dead to Sin, or that he hath put off the Body of Sins of the Flesh by the Circumcision of Christ; which may refer to the Power of his Death in the Effects thereof, by the effectual Sin-killing Operations of the holy Spirit on the Heart: And as we being dead to Sin, we are also buried with Christ in Baptism, both in the Sign, *i. e.* covered all over in the Water, which resembles in a lively Figure his Burial, and also in Signification, *i. e.* the Power and blessed Effects of his Death, having been the Death of the old Man, or that Body of Sin in us; wherein also in like manner we are also risen with him through

the Faith of the Operation of God; and this is likewise held forth both in Sign and Signification in true Baptism.

Now if this be not your Paraphrase on this Text, we cannot help it. I know many Learned Men who own Pedo-Baptism speak to the same purpose, nor is there any reason for you to say we must be silent, &c. as if we knew not what to say to this Text: But what is this for Infant-Baptism, or to prove Baptism the Antitype of Circumcision? Doth Sprinkling represent a Burial? doth the Sign or Figure of Christ's Burial appear in sprinkling a little Water on the Face, and as it is done to an Infant, in whom Faith and Regeneration is not wrought? what doth there appear in Signification? Doth not the Church of England say, that Baptism is the outward Sign of an inward spiritual Grace; sure that is but a mock-Baptism, where there is neither the Sign or Figure of Christ's Death and Burial, &c. nor that inward Work wrought upon the Person baptized, which is signified or ought to be signified thereby, *viz.* That the said Person is dead to Sin, and raised up by the Faith of the Operation of God to walk in newness of Life.

But alas, this it seems is not the thing; 'tis not so much to prove Baptism to be the Antitype of Circumcision, as 'tis to prove Baptism to be the continuation of a Jewish Custom: for to speak more properly, you intimate, that to this purpose, you mention these things. Sure all understanding Men, as well Pedo-Baptists as others, must needs loath your Notion; but I know you are not alone herein, there are some others who have asserted the same thing; which perhaps encouraged you thus to write: But to correct your Rashness, and silence you and them to, consider what I and the fore-mentioned Gentleman have said. Is it not enough that Infant-Baptism should be built upon no better a Foundation than the Tradition of the Apostate Gentile Church, and the Decrees of Popes and General Councils, but that it must also be grounded on the erroneous Customs of the Jewish Talmud? But to proceed, that Circum-

Circumcision may answer, or run Parallel with Baptism, you bring in the Practice of some Heathen Nations who circumcised their Females; we shall have it anon; the truth is, the Proof and Explanation of Infant-Baptism shall be sufficiently made out before you have done; if fabulous and erroneous Traditions of Jews, Heathens, and Apostate Christians will do it; but if no better Authority or Proof can be brought for it than what is contained in your *Mercury*, 'tis time for all good Christians with Shame enough to cast it off. Should I tell my Reader why some Heathens circumcised their Females, it might greatly expose you. But to close with your first Question, take what Dr. *Jer. Taylor*, late Bishop of *Down*, hath said upon this Conceit, i. e. that Circumcision figured Baptism; these are his words, viz. 'The Argument, saith he, from Circumcision is invalid upon infinite Configurations: Figures and Types prove nothing unless a Command go along with them, or some Express to signify such to be their purpose: for the Deluge of Waters and the Ark of *Noah* were Figures of Baptism, saith *Peter*. 'If therefore the Circumstances of the one should be drawn to the other, we should make Baptism a Prodigy rather than a Rite. The Paschal Lamb was a Figure of the Eucharist, which succeeds the other, as Baptism doth to Circumcision: but because there was in the Manducation of the Paschal Lamb no Prescription of Sacramental Drink, shall we thence conclude that the Eucharist is to be administered in one kind? And even in the very instance of this Argument, suppose a Correspondency of the Analogy between Circumcision and Baptism, yet their is no Correspondency of Identity; for tho it be granted, that both of them did consign the Covenant of Faith, yet there is nothing in the Circumstances of Children being circumcised that so concerns that Mystery; but that it might very well be given to Men of Reason, because Circumcision left a Character in the Flesh, which being imprinted upon the In-

fant, did its work to them when they came to Age; and such a Character was necessary, because there was no word added to the Sign; but Baptism imprints nothing that remains on the Body; and if it leaves a Character at all, it is upon the Soul to which the word is added, which is as much a part of the Sacrament as the Sign it self; for both which Reasons it is requisite that the Parry baptized should be capable of Reason, that they may be capable both of the Word and of the Sacrament, and the Impres upon the Spirit: Since therefore the Reason of the Parity does wholly fail, there is nothing left to infer a necessity of complying in the Circumstance of Age, any more than in the other Annexes of Types: Then the Infant must also precisely be baptized upon the eighth day, and Females must not be baptized at all, because not circumcised; but it were more proper, if we would understand it a right, to prosecute the Analogy from the Type to the Antitype, by the way for Letter and Spirit, and Signification; and as Circumcision figures Baptism, so also the Adjuncts of the circumcised shall signify some thing spiritual in the Adherence of Baptism; and therefore as Infants were circumcised, so spiritual Infants should be baptized, which is spiritual Circumcision; for therefore Babes had the Ministry of the Type to signify that we must, when we give our Names to Christ, become Children in Malice, and then the Type is made complete. Thus the worthy Doctor hath answered your Question, and you too. If Circumcision must be a Type of Baptism, he hath shewed how, and how not, if it be so taken; but the truth is, all Types cease when the Antitype is come, the one must give way to the other; but Circumcision did continue in full force some Years after Baptism was in full force; for Circumcision ended not till Christ nailed it to his Cross; therefore it could not be the Type of Baptism: but how a Shadow or Sign should be the proper Antitype of a Shadow I see not.

But enough hath been said to this, and I should not have said so much to it, but because your Notion seems new to some.

As touching the other two Scriptures you mention, viz. that in 1. Cor. 10. 'tis very impertinently cited for your business, to prove Circumcision the Type of Gospel-Baptism; but this Text speaks nothing of that in the least, nor no more doth that in *Petr.* Suppose the Red-sea was a Figure of Baptism, and so also the Water and Ark of *Nash*; what of all this, if you had urged the Fathers and Children were baptized to *Mosis* in the Sea and in the Cloud, and therefore Children may be Baptized? I would have answered you that was but a figurative Baptism, and proves nothing; besides, it would prove Unbelievers may be baptized also, because there was a mixt Multitude as well so Baptized, as were the Fathers and their Children; besides, much Cattel were with them in the Sea, and under the Cloud.

Quest. 2. What certain indubitable Grounds can we have for the Practice of Infant-Baptism.

You answer, The certain Ground is from the Scripture, and first from the Words of the Commission, *Matth. 28.* μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, disciple all Nations; and then follows, Baptizing them in the name, &c.

From the order of which words (you say) Infants are not excluded from Baptism, as is generally believed by Anabaptists; a Person may be Baptized before he is taught; for say you μαθητεύσατε, *Matheutete*, signifies, to disciple all Nations personally and subjectively; being a general word, it contains the other two that follow, viz. Baptizing and Teaching, it being a word of the imperative Mode, and the other two only Participles; so that the Commission of it is that, and the Mode of it this: but in the Mode, Baptizing them precedes Teaching them to observe all things, &c.

Reply. Because there is a Teaching follows Baptism, doth it therefore follow, according to the Order of the sacred Com-

mission, there is no Teaching indispensibly to go before the Person is baptized? You have cause to tremble for trifling and basely inverting the order of the Commission of our Blessed Saviour; what though the Greek word *Disciple*, or make Disciples, be a word of the imperative Mode; O strange! have you found it out, will this do your business, doth it therefore contain the other two? I ask you whether a Man may not be made a Disciple, and not be Baptized, or be Baptized, and yet not be discipled? *Matth. 13. 52.* 'tis μαθηδούλις, in *Matth. 28.* 'tis disciple ye; here 'tis discipled, instructed, or that is taught, and 'tis from the same Verb with the other: 'Tis evident notwithstanding all your Flourish, that Teaching, according to the Order of the Commission, goes, and must go before Baptizing, though the Person baptized is to be taught afterwards; also, all things that Christ commanded his Disciples, both as to Doctrine and Practice, that so they may be faithful Followers of Christ unto the end. This Teaching after Baptism indeed the Baptists cannot deny, unless they should be so foolish as to say, a Baptized Believer needs no further teaching, &c. but you know in your Consciences, we deny, and that too by the Authority of the Commission, that any ought to be Baptized, but such who are made Disciples by their first being taught. Doth Baptism, Sirs, make either Children or others Disciples? if you do not assert that, what do you say: and if all Nations, or any in the Nations, are to be Baptized before they are taught or made Disciples, why may not a Minister, by the Authority of the Commission, baptize Turks, Pagans and Infidels, with their Children, as well as the Infants of Christian People?

Moreover, if so be Baptizing may go before Teaching, or Persons being made Disciples, why did *Philip* answer the *Eunuch* after that manner, when he asked him why he might not be Baptized? the Answer is, If thou believest with all thy Heart, thou mayest; intri-

intimating, unless he so believed he might not. Also why did Christ make Disciples first, and then baptize them? *Joh. 4. 1.* I must also tell you, that your Exposition of the Commission in *Matthew*, doth tend to invert the Order of the same Commission in

Mark 16. 15, 16. where our Saviour commands his Disciples to go and preach the Gospel to every Creature, and then saith, *He that believeth and is Baptized, shall be saved*; 'tis not he that is baptized and then believeth; but to give divers godly and learned *Pedo-Baptists* their due, they I find dare not attempt to invert the Order of the Holy Commission, as you seem to do, though it shakes the Foundation of their own Practice: See Reverend Mr. *Purkins* on these Words, *Teach all Nations, baptizing them*; saith he, I explain the former thus; 'First of all, it is said, Teach them, that is, make them my Disciples by teaching them to believe and repent: Here we are to consider the Order which God observes in making with Men a Covenant in Baptism; first of all he calls them by his Word and Spirit to believe and repent. Then in the second Place, he makes a Promise of Mercy and Forgiveness. And then thirdly, he seals his Promise by Baptism: They, says he, that know not nor consider this Order which God used in covenanting with them in Baptism, deal preposterously, over-slipping the Commandment of repenting and believing, and is the cause of so much Prophaneness in the World. Much to the same Purpose saith Mr. *Baxter*, *Right to Baptism*, p. 149, 150. speaking of the Order of this Commission; 'Christ gave to his Disciples, their first Task (says he) is to make Disciples, which are by *Mark* called Believers.

The second Work is to baptize them, whereto is annexed the Promise of Salvation.

The third Work is to teach them all other things which are after to be learned in the School of Christ. To concern this Order, saith he, is to concern the Rules of Order, for where can we find it if not here? I pro-

test my Conscience is fully satisfied from this Text, that there is one sort of Faith saving, even Saving that must go before Eap-tism, the Profession whereof the Minister must expect.

Your second Scripture-Ground is that of *whole Families being baptized*.

Reply; You cannot be ignorant that this Proof hath been often invalid: How many Families are there in this City, in which there is not one Infant. Besides, 'tis said, *Paul* preached the Word to the Jailor and to all in his House: also 'tis expressly said, *He believed in God with all his House*. We have as much Ground to believe, in these Families there were some Servants or Children who were Unbelievers, as to believe there were little Babes; and because whole Houholds were said to be baptized, therefore unbelieving Servants, Sons and Daughters, as well as little Children: Others may infer ungodly Servants and unbelieving Children that were grown up to be Men and Women, were baptized also in those Families. In Jailors Families now-a-days 'tis evident there are too many wicked and ungodly ones; and this Jailor was none of the best before converted, 'tis plain. Besides, *whoso or all*, doth not comprehend always every individual Person, as *1 Sam. 21. 28.* Moreover, Dr. *Hammond* saith, 'That to conclude, Infants were baptized, because Houholds are mentioned so to be, is, saith he, unconvincing, and without Demonstration, it being so uncertain whether there were any Children in those Families: His Letter p. 471. Still 22.

Your third Scripture-Ground is that of the Promise (you say Covenant) made to you and your Children.

Reply; How often have we shewed that this Text proves not that any Children *quatenus*, as such, should be baptized, nor, as such, that they are in the Covenant of Grace, or have the Promise made to them; the Promise runs to the Jews and to their Offspring, and not to them only, but to Gentiles also, who were said to be *separated off*: But pray observe,

serve, 'tis to no more of the Jews and their Children or Offspring, and such who were afar off, than the Lord shall call or make Disciples by the Word and effectual Operations of the Holy Spirit. My Sons and Daughters are as much my Children when they are twenty or thirty Years old, as well as when Babies. Dr. Hammond alio grants, Children in this Text doth not refer to Infants as such, but to the Posterity of the Jews, p. 490. *Stell.* 81. *If ye be Christ's, then you are Abraham's Seed, and Heirs according to the Promise. The Children of the Flesh, saith Paul, these are not the Children of God; but the Children of the Promise are accounted for the Seed, Rom. 9. 8. Not if you be the Offspring of Abraham according to the Flesh, or Seed of Believers.*

Your fourth Scripture-Proof is, *that of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.*

Reply. This proves no more Children ought to be baptized, than they ought to receive the Lord's Supper, Baptism being a mere positive Precept, and only depends upon the Will and sovereign Pleasure of the great Law-giver Jesus Christ. A thousand such Instances prove not they ought to be baptized, except there was a Precept annexed, or Precedent for it in God's Word. Besides, of such, &c. (as one well observes) may intend such and such that have like Qualities, viz. harmless, meek, &c. as Children: Therefore the Anabaptists (as you call them) are not unchangeable, who say, Infants have no more Right to Baptism than unreasonable Creatures; for what can give them Right thereto, but the Authority of God's Word?

You ask what Priviledg the Children of Believers have above Unbelievers? We answer, They have the advantage of their Parents Prayers, Instruction, godly Education, and good Example.

But, say you, *they are holy.*

Answer. We deny it intends federal Holiness, such as qualifies Children for Baptism. We read in *Mal. 2. 15.* of Marriage, and that Children begotten in lawful Wedlock are called a *godly Seed*, in opposition to their being illegitimate. Now that it was about Mar-

riages the Corinthians wrote to *S. Paul*, is evident, they doubting of the Lawfulness of abiding with their unbelieving Husbands and Wives: And to satisfy them about this Matter, he tells them, the unbelieving Husband was sanctified by (or rather to) the believing Wife, &c. that is set apart or consecrated to each other in lawful Marriage, (for 'tis doubtless no other Sanctification) *else were your Children unclean*, that is, Bastards; *but now are they holy*, that is, lawfully begotten. And we find divers Learned Men give the same Exposition on these Words. See *Beza*; That the Word, saith he, is not to be understood an Adverb of Time, but a Conjunction that's wont to be used in the assumption of Arguments; and so the Sense is [*But now*], that is, Forasmuch as the unbelieving Husband is sanctified to the Wife, your Children are holy, that is, lawfully begotten and born. We read in *Zachary*, that the Bells and Pots of the Lord's House were holy; may be the Papists from thence presume to baptize Bells, and they have as much reason so to do, as there is by the Authority of God's Word for any to baptize Infants. As touching what you speak of little Children coming to Christ, that the Original or Greek Word is the same with *προσηλυτισιν* to proselyte, what signifies that? how often is that Word mentioned in other Places, to signify any manner of coming to? &c. 'Tis a strange way of proselyting Persons, and never to teach or instruct them. See these Scriptures where the same Word is used: *Προσηλυτισεν αυτον*, *Mat. 26. 7.* *There came unto him.* *Mat. 26. 17.* *The Disciples came;* *Gr. προσηλυτισεν οι μαθηται.* *Mat. 26. 49.* *Forasmuch he came to Jesus;* *Gr. ο ιουδης προσηλυτισεν τον ιησου.* *Mat. 26. 69.* *There came unto him (a Girl or) a Damsel;* *Gr. προσηλυτισεν αυτην μια παιδισκη.* *Mat. 26. 73.* *And after a while (or a while after) came unto him they that stood by;* *Gr. αυτη μεκειν ο προσηλυτισεντες οι εσταντες.*

But you proceed further to prove Infants ought to be baptized, and that from the Universal Consent of the Churches in all Countries: For (as you say) *Tertul. de prescriptis haerit*, ch. 28. *Equid verisimile*, &c. Had the

Church.

Churches erred, they would have varied, &c.

Reply. If you cannot prove Infant-Baptism from Scripture, you are gone for ever; for this Argument of yours to prove it is like that of the Papists, to prove their Church the true Church, viz. *Universality* and *Antiquity*, &c. it was not the Practice of the Churches first planted by the Apostles, that's plain; and 'tis as evident other Errors were as universally received, and some very early too; besides, you can't be ignorant how the Greek Church varies from the Latin.

But pray take what Dr. Barlow hath said to this, a worthy Bishop of the Church of England. 'I believe, and know, saith he, that there is neither Precept nor Example in Scripture for Pædo-baptism, nor any just Evidence for it for above 200 years after Christ; that *Trithemius* condemns it as an unwarrantable Custom, and *Narsensis* a good while after him dislikes it: sure I am, that in the primitive Times, they were *Catechumens*, then *Manumissors* or *Baptizants*, and that not only Pagans and Children of Pagans converted, but Children of Christian Parents: The truth is, I do believe Pædo-Baptism, how or by whom I know not, come into the World in the second Century, and in the third and fourth began to be practised, though not generally, and defended as lawful from the Text, *John 3. 5.* grossly misunderstood upon the like gross Mistake, *John 6. 53.* They did for many Centuries, both in the *Greek* and *Latin* Church communicate Infants, and give them the Lord's Supper; and I confess they might do both as well as either, &c.

Thus both your Arguments from universal Consent and Antiquity, the Learned Doctor hath sufficiently answered. And I rather let him answer you than to answer you in my own words, thinking what he says, may be more regarded by some than what I say. But you to prove from Antiquity, that Infant-Baptism was practised in the first, second and third Centuries, you say you are able to demonstrate, that there was ne-

ver any particular Congregation of Anabaptists till about three hundred years after Christ; and seem to build much upon these three last Arguments.

Reply. If you had said there were no Baptized Congregations, i. e. such who only baptized Believers, you had asserted a great Untruth, sith all the Primitive Apostolical Churches were such, none being admitted to Baptism for the first and second Centuries, but the Adult, i. e. such who professed their Faith, (as in due time may be sufficiently proved) notwithstanding all your Flourish or Pretences; but suppose it be granted there were no Congregations till then called Anabaptist, what doth that signify? it was because there were not till about that time any (as Dr. Barlow and divers others say) who practised Pædo-baptism: Baptists could not be called Anabaptists or Re-baptizers till there were some who held for Infant-Baptism; so that this directly makes against you. Moreover, many Rites which you disown as human Traditions, crept very early into the World, and were practised generally too in the Apostacy of the Church.

Quest. 3. *Whether Infant-Baptism is to be found in the Scripture?*

You answer, not expressly in the Letter, but from necessary and unavoidable Consequences, as you say you have already shewn.

Reply. 'Tis a hard case that one of the great Sacraments of the New Testament should in your Thoughts, lie so dark and obscure in the New Testament, that it can't be proved from it but by Consequences; but harder that Learned Men of your way, should affirm that your Consequences for it, drawn from those Texts you mention, are not natural, and prove nothing; besides, you can't be ignorant that the first Asserters of Infant-Baptism never undertook the proof of it from such Scripture-Grounds or Consequences, but from the Authority and Power of the Church; for as you think the Church hath power to change the Act of Baptizing unto Sprinkling, so

they affirmed she had like Power to change the Subject, and instead of Believers to baptize Infants who have no Understanding. Pray what Precept of the Mosaicall Law lay so dark or obscure, that it could not be proved without Consequences? Did not *Moses* make every Law, Precept or Command plain, that he that run might read it? and yet Christ is said to exceed *Moses*, being faithful as a Son over his own House, *Heb. 3*. Those Consequences you have drawn, all impartial Men may see prove nothing.

Moreover, what you speak about those great Articles of the Christian Religion, as if they could not be proved without Consequences, must not by any means be allowed; nor can I take it to be true. Cannot we find the Doctrine of the Trinity in the Scripture, and that Christ is God and the second Person, and that he was born of the Virgin, without Consequences? Is it Wisdom in you in such a corrupt Age as this is, to lay down such Assertions? Were those things the Matter of Controversy between you and me, you should hear what positive and plain Scripture Proof might (as you know hath often already) be brought upon that account; but to pass by this, I affirm the Baptism of Believers lies plain in God's Word, but Infant-Baptism is not to be found therein.

Quest. 4. *Why was not Christ baptized before he was thirty Years old?*

You answer, From the same Reason that the Jailor, the Eunuch and St. *Peter's* Converts were not, viz. there is no adhering to a Doctrine before it is instituted or preached; but say you Infant-Baptism was much before our Saviour's time, as amongst those of riper Years since, and that you say is Proof enough.

Reply. It can't be Proof enough to answer the Question, and as to prove Infant-Baptism it utterly fails; but if Infant-Baptism was much before our Saviour's time as an Institution of God, there was no Want of an Institution when he was a Babe; and therefore your Reason why he deferred his Baptism is

gone. Was it in being long before, and yet not instituted or appointed by *Jehovah*? Do you not herein implicitly confess that Custom amongst the Jews was human? Nor will it serve your turn to say, it was instituted a-new as a Gospel-Ordinance, because you affirm Baptism under the Gospel was the Continuation of that old Custom, with the *Super-addition of the full Force of Baptism, viz. a Consecration or Seal of the Covenant*. Do you not intimate it was not instituted a new, but rather a Custom continued? upon which you (with that Addition and some others before you) seem to lay the great Stakes of your Infants Baptism. And if some Additions were made to the old Custom, why might there not be some Diminutions also? and if it were a-new instituted, it is all one as if it had never been in being before; for the Right any have to Baptism and manner of Administration, and all things appertaining to it, must of necessity wholly depend upon the new Institution or Law of Christ: If therefore Gospel-Baptism wholly depends on the new Institution, then the old Custom is gone for ever (had it been a Mosaicall Rite) like a Legacy bequeathed in a Will, made void by the Testator's last Will and Testament; though some part of the same thing may be repeated in the last Will, that was in the first, yet the last must decides the Controversy: but in Christ's last Will and Testament, Infant-Baptism is not to be found, nor was it indeed an Ordinance ordained of God before Christ's time. See my Answer about this in Answer to the first Question.

2. Certainly had it been the Will of God, Children should have been baptized as such, Christ had been baptized when in his Infancy; no doubt God who is a free Agent could not want an Administrator; he could have sent *John* into the World sooner, or have commissioned some other Person to have done it. But since the Holy Ghost in the Gospel relates the time of his Baptism, and that it was not till he was about thirty Years old, it clearly shews us that adult Persons ought to be admitted to that Ordinance only, and not Babes:

Babes: By which Example of his he hath strengthened his Commission, or at least wise shew'd the Congruity or sweet Agreement there is between his Precept and his own Practice.

Question 5. *Why Sprinkling, and not Dipping?* You answer, Our Church denies not the latter, (that is, dipping) but looks upon it as a clear Representation of our Saviour's descending into the Grave, abiding there, and rising up again, &c.

But say you, the Church has power to dispense with Circumstantial and manner of Acting, tho not with the Act it self, &c.

Reply. What your Church is I know not; the Church of *England* doth acknowledge, I must confess, that Baptism is Dipping, but I never heard they have of late times so practised. But how dare you say, the Church hath power to dispense with Dipping, and change it into Sprinkling? Who gave her such Power? Where do you read of it? You call it a Circumstantial, but I am not of your Mind; I must say 'tis an Essential; nay, 'tis no Baptism at all, if not Dipping; for Baptism is to dip, which to confirm I could give you a Cloud of Witnesses learned in the Greek Tongue; therefore 'tis not the manner of the Act, but the Act it self; to baptize is one Act, and to rouse or sprinkle Water is another; the manner of the Act of dipping, or baptizing, is to put the Body into the Water backward, or forward, or side-ways, or with a swift or gentle Motion. Dipping is dipping, and sprinkling sprinkling, which Act will never be baptizing whilst the World stands. You say well, dipping or burying the Body in the Water, is a clear and lively Representation of the Death, Burial and Resurrection of Christ. And hence 'tis said, that such who are indeed baptized, are buried with Christ in Baptism. To which you might have added, 'tis also a Sign of our being dead to Sin, and of our being raised up with Christ by the Faith of the Operation of God, to walk in graces of Life.

And hence I infer, Infants ought not to be

baptized, because there doth not, cannot appear in them that glorious internal Work of the Spirit which ought to be signified thereby; and as they for this reason cannot be the proper Subjects of Baptism: So like wise it cannot be done by sprinkling, because that Act cannot represent those Signs and Gospel-Mysteries, which the Law-giver intended should be held forth in that holy Administration.

But why do you say this is a circumstantial Thing? Was not *Nadab* and *Abihu's* Transgression, and that of *Uzzah's* more like Circumstantial than this is? and yet their Error cost them their Lives. Or, hath the Gospel-Church a greater dispensing Power in such Cases, than the Church had under the Law? — Suppose the Jews should have changed Circumcision, or cutting off the Foreskin of the Flesh, to the paring the Nails of their Children, or to cut off a little Skin off of the Fingers Ends; would that have been Circumcision? no doubt a better Circumcision than Sprinkling is Baptism. Gentlemen, will you call any Part, or Branch, or Thing that appertains to a positive Precept, a Circumstance which the Church has power to dispense with? If you should, whicher would this lead you? You may after that Notion strangely curtail Christ's Institutions in other respects.

Question 6. *What think you of those that die in Infancy unbaptized?*

You answer, Of such are the Kingdoms of Heaven.

Reply. So saith our blessed Saviour, but they have, say I, no Right thereto, or belong unto the Kingdom of Heaven, because sprinkled with a little Water; nor would they have any further Right, should they be indeed baptized, since there is no Command of God for it.

Quest. 7. *If Children be saved whether baptized or not, what signifies Baptism?*

You answer, 'tis a Badge of Christ, an evident Note of Distinction from the Children of Infidels: and as we come to the Know-

ledg of spiritual Things by Sense, so 'tis an Evidence of a greater assurance of the Favour of God to them, being invisibly introduced into the Covenant of Grace.

Reply. 'Tis no Badg of Christ before, because he never gave it to them; and if it be an evident Note of Distinction from the Children of Infidels, 'tis wholly of Man's making. You know what wonderful things are ascribed to Christ by the *Papists* who use Salt, Oil and Spittle, &c. in Baptism, and to other devised Rites and Ceremonies used by them; and I have as much ground from God's Word to believe what they say, as what you say, who affirm and prove not; why, do you not say they are thereby made *Members of Christ, Children of God, and Inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven*? Pray, what an assurance can that give them of the Favour of God, unless he had appointed it, and imparted some spiritual Grace thereby to them? Nay, and what Arguments do you bring to prove they thereby are introduced into the Covenant of Grace? Can any outward Act bring or introduce People either young or old into the Covenant of Grace, if they are brought thereby into the Covenant of Grace? I hope they shall all be saved that are baptized (as you call it) I hope you are not for falling away; or that any Soul who is in the Covenant of Grace shall perish eternally. Moreover, how can they come to the knowledge of spiritual Things by Sense? indeed in the case of Circumcision, which left a Mark in the Flesh, they might more probably understand by the sight of the Eye, those spiritual Things signified by it; but Baptism leaves no such Mark: Nothing appears to their Senses when they come to knowledge that can have any such Tendency; I fear rather it is a great means when they are grown up, to blind their Eyes, and cause them to think (as many ignorant People do) that they are made thereby Christians, and so in a saved State, and never look after the Work of Regeneration.

Quest. 8. *Whether have Children Faith or no; since Faith and Repentance are Pre-requisites to Baptism?*

Your Answer is. That you have shewed, that according to the words of the Commission, Baptizing goes before Teaching; therefore there is not such a Pre-requisite as some dream of; you have said so I must confess from the Commission, but have not proved it, but rather made work for Repentance, by striving to invert the Order of the sacred Commission of our Saviour, &c. But say you admit Faith as pre-requisite to Baptism; we could answer, that Children have Faith *potentia*, tho not in *actu* *visibili*: As an Artist when he is indisposed or asleep, is *potentially* an Artist, tho not actually.—

Reply. Strange you should attempt to affirm Children have Faith *potentia*; who told you so? when was this imaginary Faith infused into them? it must be either by Nature, Art, or Grace or else your Simily is lost. You are look'd upon indeed to be Philosophers, but this is above my Understanding, or your own Demonstration; but you suppose that Passage in *Matth. 18.* doth your business: whereas 'tis evident that our Saviour speaks there of such little ones who were indeed capable to believe; it was not such a little one as you would have baptized. We doubt not but God doth oftimes infuse Grace very early in the Souls of some very young, and calls them to believe, and to the knowledge of the Truth; but what is this to all Infants in general? But more fully to answer what you say about Children having Faith, take what Dr. Taylor hath wrote upon this Conceit. 'Whether Infants have Faith or no, is a Question (saith he) 'to be disputed by Persons that care not how much they say, and how little they prove.

1. 'Personal and actual Faith they have none, for they have no Acts of Understanding: and besides, how can any Man know that they have, since he never saw any Sign of it, neither was he told so by any that could tell?

2. 'Some

2. ' Some say they have imputative Faith, but then so let the Sacrament be too; that is, if they have the Parents Faith, or the Churches, then so let Baptism be imputed also by derivation from them, and as in their Mothers Womb; and while they hung on their Mothers Breasts, they live upon their Mothers Nourishment; so they may upon the Baptism of their Parents, or their Mother the Church: for since Faith is necessary to the suscepiion of Baptism, and they themselves confess it by striving to find out new kinds of Faith to daub the matter up; such as the Faith, such must be the Sacrament; for there is no Proportion between an actual Sacrament and an imputative Faith, this being in immediate and necessary order to that. And whatsoever can be said to take from the Necessity of actual Faith, all that and much more may be said to excuse from the actual suscepiion of Baptism. The first of these Devices was that of *Luther* and his Scholars; the second of *Calvin* and his; and yet there is a third Device which the Church of *Rome* teaches, and that is, that Infants have habitual Faith, but who told them so? how can they prove it? what Revelation or Reason teaches any such thing? are they by this Habit so much as disposed to an actual Belief without a new Master? Can an Infant sent into a Mahometan Province, be more confident for Christianity when he comes to be a Man, than if he had not been baptized? are there any Acts precedent, concomitant or consequent to this pretended Habit? This strange Invention is absolutely without Art; without Scripture, Reason or Authority, but the Men are to be excused unless there were a better.

And again to this purpose, *pag. 242.*
' And if any Man runs for Succour to that exploded *Crispington*, that Infants have

Faith, or any other inspired Habit of I know not what or how, we desire no more advantage in the World than that they are constrained to answer without Revelation, against Reason, common Sense, and all the Experience in the World. As to what you speak as to those young Children you mention, it proves nothing; and some of your Stories seem childless, and do not look as if they came from Men of such pretended Ingenuity.

But to close all; We have the worst of you at the last, wherein you in a very scurrilous manner cast Reproach upon a great Body of Godly People (who differ not from other Orthodox Christians in any Essentials of Salvation, no nor in Fundamentals of Church-Constitutions, save in the Point of Baptism) and will you by reason of the Enormities of some who formerly bore the Name of Anabaptists, mentioning the old *Munster* Story, condemned as such, all that bear that Name?

In Answer to which I ask you, whether the like Reflections might not have been cast on Christ's Apostles, because they had a *Judas* among them? or on the Church of the *Corinthians*, because of the incestuous Person? Besides, you know not but it may be a Lie raised upon those People by the envious Papists, who have rendered *Calvin* and *Luther* as odious as you do these Anabaptists. You would think it hard, if I should ask you what sort they were that *Ralph Wallis* used to expose, and fill his Carts with? or of those Clergy-men who were Pseudo-Baptists, yet were for filthy Crimes executed.

To conclude, I wish that all Bitterness of Spirit was expelled, Love and Charity exercised towards one another, tho in some things we may differ from one another.

Queries for the Athenian Society to Answer, some of which were formerly sent to them, but were passed by in silence, 1. On Infants the Subjects of Baptism. And, 2. What Baptism is.

First; **W**Hether there was not a twofold Covenant made with Abraham, one with his Fleſhly Seed, and the other with his Spiritual Seed, signified by the Bond Woman and the Free Woman, and their Sons Ishmael and Isaac?

If so, I query. Whether Circumcision was an Ordinance that appertained to the Covenant of Grace, and was the Seal of it? 1. Because 'tis contradistinguished from the Covenant of Grace, or free Promise of God, Rom. 4. 2. And 'tis also called a Yoke of Bondage. And, 3. 'Tis said also, that he that was circumcised, was a Debtor to keep the whole Law. And, 4. Because Ishmael, who was not a Child of the Covenant of Grace with Esau, and many others, yet were required to be circumcised as well as Isaac. And, 5. Since 'tis positively said Faith was imputed to Abraham for Righteousness not in Circumcision, How was it imputed then? when he was circumcised, or uncircumcised? not when he was circumcised, but when he was uncircumcised, Rom. 4. 10.

Secondly; Whether the being the Male-Children of Believers, as such, gave them right to Circumcision, or not rather the meer positive Command of God to Abraham; since we do not read of any other Godly Man's Seed in Abraham's days, or since, had any right thereto, but only such who were born in his House, or bought with his Money?

Thirdly; Whether Circumcision could be said to be the Seal of any Man's Faith save Abraham's only, seeing 'tis said, he received the Sign of Circumcision, a Seal of the Righteousness of the Faith he had [mark] yet being uncircumcised, that he might be the Father of all that believe; which was the Priviledg of Abraham only: for how could Circumcision be a Seal to Children of that Faith they had

before circumcised, seeing they had no Faith at all, as had Abraham their Father, they being obliged by the Law of God to be circumcised at eight days old?

Fourthly; What is it which you conceive Circumcision did, or Baptism doth seal to Children, or make sure; since a Seal usually makes firm all the Blessings or Priviledges contained in that Covenant 'tis prefix'd to? Doubtless if the Fleſhly Seed of Believers, as such, are in the Covenant of Grace, and have the Seal of it, they shall be saved; because we are agreed, that the Covenant of Grace is well ordered in all things; and sure there is no final falling, therefore how should any of them miss of eternal Life? and yet we see many of them prove wicked and ungodly, and so live and die; if you say it seals only the external Part and Priviledges of the Covenant of Grace?

Fifthly; I demand to know what those External Priviledges are, seeing they are denied the Sacrament of the Lord's-Supper, and all other External Rites whatsoever? if you say when they believe they shall partake of those Blessings, so, say I, shall the Children of Unbelievers as well as they.

Sixthly; If the Fleſhly Seed, or Children of believing Gentiles, as such, are to be accounted the Seed of Abraham; I query, Whether they are his Natural Seed, or his Spiritual Seed? if not his Natural Seed, nor his Spiritual Seed, what right can they have to Baptism, or Church-Membership, from any Covenant-Transactions God made with Abraham?

Seventhly; Whether those different grounds upon which the Right of Infant-Baptism is pretended by the Fathers of old and the Modern Divines, doth well agree with an Institution that is a meer positive Rite, depending wholly on the Will of the Legislator, doth

doth not give just cause to all to question its Authority?

1. Some Peto-Baptists asserted, It took away Original Sin, and such who denied it were anathematized.

2. Some affirm, That Children are in the Covenant; and being the Seed of Believers, are federally Holy, therefore ought to be Baptized.

3. Another sort of Peto-Baptists say, They ought to be Baptized, by virtue of their Parents Faith.

4. Others affirm, They have Faith themselves, and are Disciples, and therefore must be baptized.

5. Another sort Baptize them upon the Faith of their Sureties.

6. And another sort of Peto-Baptists say, It wholly depends upon the Power and Authority of the Church.

7. Some say, It was an Apostolical unwritten Tradition; but others deny that, and affirm, It may be proved from the Word of God.

Sure, if it was of God, or his Institution, the Peto-Baptists would not be thus divided and confounded among themselves.

Eightly; Is it not an evil thing, and very absurd for any to say, Baptism is a Symbol of present Regeneration, and yet apply it to Babies, in whom nothing of the things signified there by doth or can appear? And also to say, *Baptizing then is the Name, &c.* when indeed he doth not Baptize but only Ratify the Child? and to say Baptism is a lively Figure of Christ's Death, Burial, and Resurrection, and yet only sprinkle or pour a little Water upon the Face of the Child?

Ninthly; Whether that can be an Ordinance of Christ, for which there is neither Command nor Example in all the Word of God, nor no Promise made to such who do it, nor Threats denounced on such who neglect it or do it not? For though there are both Promises made to Believers Baptized, and Threats denounced on such who neglect it, yet where are there any such in respect of Infant-Baptism?

Tenthly; Whether a Pagan, or Indian, who should attain to the knowledge of the Greek Tongue, or of the English, or any other Tongue into which the Original should be translated, by reading over the New Testament a thousand times he could ever find Infants ought to be Baptized; if not, how doth it appear the Faith of People about Peto-Baptism stands in the Power of God, and knowledge of his Word, and not rather in the Wisdom of Men, who having endeavoured, with all the Art and Cunning they can, to draw pretended Consequences for it, tho' after all they do not naturally and genuinely follow from the Premises to which they refer?

Eleventhly; Whether Christ having expressly mentioned the Qualifications of such as are to be Baptized, *viz.* actual Repentance, Faith, and the Answer of a good Conscience, &c. doth not thereby exclude all those who are not capable of those Qualifications?

Twelfthly; Whether it doth not reflect upon the Care, Wisdom, and Faithfulness of Jesus Christ, who as a Son over his own House, exceeded the Care and Faithfulness of *Moses*, to affirm, Infants ought to be Baptized, and yet it cannot be found in all the New Testament? Can it be thought it should be a Gospel-Precept, nay, a Sacrament, and yet Christ speak nothing of it? or could it be in the Commission, and yet the Apostles never to mention it, but contrariwise, require Faith of all they admitted to Baptism? *Paul* says, He declared the whole Counsel of God, and said nothing of it in any of his Epistles, nor no where else. How many thousands of Children were born to baptized Believers, from the time of Christ's Ascension, to the time *John* wrote the *Revelations*, but not one word of any one Child Baptized?

Thirteenthly; Whether in matter of positive Right, such as Baptism is, we ought not to keep expressly and punctually to the Revelation of the Will of the Law-giver?

Fourteenthly; Whether the Baptism of Infants be not a dangerous Error, since it tends to deceive and blind the Eyes of poor ignorant People, who think they are thereby made

Christi-

Christians, and so never look after Regeneration, nor true Baptism, which represents or signifies that inward Work of Grace upon the Heart?

Fifteen; Whether the Ancient Church, who gave the Lord's Supper to Infants, as well as Baptism, might not be allowed as well to do the one as the other, since Faith and Holy Habits are as much required in those who are to be Baptized, as in such who come to the Lord's Table? And all such in the Apostolick Church, who were Baptized, were immediately admitted to break Bread, &c. And also the Arguments taken from the Covenant, and because said to be Holy, and to belong to the Kingdom of Heaven, are as strong for them to receive the Lord's Supper, there being no Command nor Example for either, and human Tradition carrying it equally for both for several Centuries.

Sixteen; Whether *Nadab, Abihu, and Uzab's* Transgressions were not as much Circumstantial, and so as small Errors, as to alter Dipping into Sprinkling; and from an understanding Believer, to a poor ignorant Babe? And whether to allow the Church a Power to make such Alterations, be not dangerous? see *Rev. 22.* And doth not this open a Door to other Innovations?

Seventeen; Whether there is any just Cause for Men to vilify and reproach the People called *Anabaptists*, for their baptizing Believers, and denying Infants to be Subjects thereof, seeing they have the plain and direct Word of God to warrant their practice, i. e. not only the Commission, but also the continual usage of the Apostles and Ministers of the Gospel all along in the New Testament, who Baptized none but such who made profession of their Faith? And the Church of England also saith, *Faith and Repentance are required of such who are to be Baptized.* We dare not Baptize our Children, because we cannot find it written, 'tis from the holy Fear of God, lest we should offend and sin against him, by adding to his Word.

Eighteen; What should be the reason that our faithful Translators of the Bible should

leave the Greek word *Baptism*, or *Baptisma*, and not turn it into English, seeing the Dutch have not done so; but contrariwise translate, for *John the Baptist, John the Dooper*; and for *he Baptized, he dooped, or dipped them*?

Nineteen; Whether those who translate out of one Language into another, ought not to translate every word into the same Language into which they turn it, and not leave any word in the same Original Tongue, which the People understand not, and for whose sakes they undertook that Work; and not to translate every word, but also to give the right, literal, genuine and proper signification of each word, and not the remote, improper, or collateral signification of it? Which if our Translators of the Bible had so done, I query whether the Doubt among the Unlearned, concerning what the word *Baptisma* signifies, had not ceased?

Twenty; Seeing the Greek Church uses Immersion & not Asperision, may it not be look'd upon as a great Argument against Sprinkling, especially seeing they disown the Baptism of the Latin Church, because they use Sprinkling; for doubtless the Greeks best knew the genuine and proper signification of that word, that Tongue being their own natural Language in which the New Testament was wrote?

21. Whether if a Minister should administer the Lord's Supper in one kind only, and so doing, it cannot answer the great Design of Christ the Law-giver, i. e. the breaking of his Body, and shedding of his Blood, would not phrase that Holy Institution? If so, whether such, who instead of Dipping the whole Body, do but sprinkle or pour a little Water on the Face, do not also profane the holy Sacrament of Baptism, since it is not so done to represent in a lively Figure the Death, Burial and Resurrection of Christ, with our Death unto Sin, and vivification unto newness of Life? *Rom. 6. Col. 2. 11, 12.*

22. Whether all such who have only been sprinkled, ought not to be deemed Unbaptized Persons, since Asperision is not Immersion,

sion, or Rantizing nor Baptizing; for though the Greek word *Baptizo*, in a remote and improper sense may signify to wash, yet, as the Learned confess, it is such a washing as is done by dipping, swilling, or plunging the Person or Thing all over in the Water?

23. Since you say Children have Faith *potentia*: I query, Whether Unbelievers, and all ungodly Persons, have not also the like Faith *potentia* as well as Children, and so the same Right to Baptism? We grant they may have Faith hereafter; What tho?

There is one Assertion and Argument laid down by you, which I omitted in my Answer; which as it is New, so it must needs expose you, viz. *If God be pleased to radiate or shine upon the Souls of Children in Heaven, and they do behold the Face of God, as our Saviour says, then it follows that they have Faith in Heaven, and why not on Earth? (see Heb. 11. 27.)* These are your very words.

Reply: I had thought that in Heaven the Faith of the Adult ceases, i. e. the strong and saving Faith of Believers? Doth not the Apostle say, Then we come to receive the End of our Faith? Is not Faith turned there into Vision? Is not Faith the Evidence of Things not seen, and the Substance of Things hoped for? Heb. 11. 1, 2. Divines say, Faith, Hope, &c. cease then, and that 'tis only Love that continues. What is it they have not received in Heaven, which they trust in God for? Nor is your Conclusion good, Had they Faith there, they may have it here. The Text you cite, *Heb. 11. 27.* refers to that Faith *Moses* had on Earth, who saw him who was invisible: God seems so to us here; but what a sight we shall have of him in Heaven, we know not. Doth not the Apostle say, we shall behold Face to Face, and the pure in Heart shall see God? Shall that be such a sight that *Moses* had whilst on Earth?

Questions relating to the Fathers, with respect to the Controversy about Infant-Baptism.

What reason can be given why *Nazianzen*, an eminent Greek Father, should counsel the deferring the Baptism of Infants, until the third or fourth Year of their Age, (except in danger of Death)? If it were in *Nazianzen's* Place, as some suppose it was, the Opinion of the whole Church would be such, that Infants, by an Apostolical Tradition, were to be baptized as such, that is, as soon as born?

Secondly: Whether all the Fathers of the third and fourth Century, both of the Greek

and Latin Church, who have wrote any thing about Infant-Baptism, do not unanimously give this as the Reason why Infants should be Baptized, viz. the washing away Original Sin, or the putting them into a Capacity of Salvation; and some of them, particularly *St. Austin*, sentencing Infants to Eternal Damnation if not Baptized?

Thirdly: If so, Whether the Fathers might not be mistaken in the Right of Infants to Baptism, as well as in the Judgment of most Protestants they are, in the Reason why they should be Baptized?

Four other Queries.

1. **Whether** God hath allowed or enjoined Parents to bring their little Babes, of two or three days old, into a Covenant with him by Baptism, (there is not to be found in the Scripture he either hath allowed or enjoined them so to do?)

2. If it cannot be proved he hath required any such thing at their Hands, Whether that Covenant can be said to bind their Conscience when they come to Age, especially since they gave no Consent to it, nor were capable so to do?

3. If this pretended Covenant was not of God's Appointment, I query, how these Children who refuse to agree to the said Covenant when at Age, can thereby be guilty, 1. Of rejecting Christ, 2. Of renouncing the Blessings of the Gospel, 3. And that 'tis Rebellion continued against their Maker, 4. That 'tis Ingratitude and Perjury to their Redeemer, 5. Gross Injustice to their Parents.

6, That 'tis self-killing Cruelty to their own Souls; 7. And a damning Sin?

4. I query, whether this be good Divinity, not rather a strange Doctrine? And whether unwarrantable Articles of Faith, taken out of the Jewish Talmud, or Turkish Alcoran, may not by as good Authority be put into a *Christian Catechism*, as such Assertions as these?

Four Queries sent by another Hand to the Athenian Society.

Gentlemen,

I Humbly conceive, that no Man knoweth what is a Duty but by the Scriptures: And since Pedit-Baptism cannot be proved by the Word of God, as every Man may know, and is generally acknowledged by the most Learned Assertors of that Practice; it therefore plainly followeth, in my Judgment, that Infant-Baptism is no Ordinance of God's Appointment, but an Innovation.

I therefore seriously query;

I. **W**hether Tradition, Jewish Talmuds, the Opinion of private Doctors; Schoolmen, &c. be a sufficient Warrant for the Churches to establish such a Practice, that hath neither Precept nor Example in the Holy Scriptures?

II. Since the pretended Foundation of Infant-Baptism, (viz. its absolute necessity to Salvation) proving to be a Mistake of the Text, John 3. 5. as is generally acknowledged by Protestants, Whether the Structure ought not to fall with it, as it did in the Case of giving the Child the Eucharist?

III. Whether the Faith of the Parent, or Gossip, on the Child's behalf, be required of God, or will be imputed to the Child by God? If not, why ventured on, and not rather a waiting for Faith in the Subject, as required in Holy Writ, by the Apostles and Primitive Churches, and seemingly by the Church of England in her Catechism?

IV. Whether the Church hath a good Warrant that will justify her before God, in changing the Mode from Dipping to Sprinkling? and whether that Alteration doth so well answer the Design of the Holy God, as that Ceremony which himself appointed?

Gentlemen,

I knew nothing of that Gentleman's Animadversions, or that he, or any Body else, intended to take notice of your *Mercury*, till I had wrote what I intended to say, tho when it was too late, I saw it.

P.O.S.T.

P O S T S C R I P T.

*Containing some Remarks upon the Athenian Mercury, Vol. 4.
Numb. 18. published Saturday, Novemb. 28. 1691.*

Gentlemen,

JUST as my Answer to your first *Mercury* about Infant-Baptism was finished, and almost printed off, your second Paper on the same Subject came to my Hand: And tho I was not concerned in the Paper called, *Animadversions on your other Mercury*; yet, till a further Answer is prepared, I shall make some Reflections upon what you have said in your pretended *Reply* to that Gentleman, &c.

1. *Sirs*, You go too fast to conclude, you b: that Paper understand wherein our strength lies, as (by this time) you may perceive, nor don't conclude you have it all yet.

2. What you say about your pretended Proof of Infant-Baptism, from that unscriptural Tradition or Custom among the Jews of proselyting whole Families to the Jewish Religion by Baptism, you may see fully answered before I saw your last *Mercury*. Have you proved that Custom among them was *jure Divino*? or, if so, that it remained and was continued by Christ?

Secondly; What you have said about Baptism, being the proper Antitype of Circumcision, is also answered: Nor does what you speak of, Types and Antitypes, not agreeing in every thing, help you. Have not we shewed the proper Antitype of Circumcision in the Flesh, is that of the Heart?

Thirdly; As to your Logical Argument, (*viz*, An Ordinance once enjoined, and never repealed, is always in force; but the Ordinance of Children in covenanting, was once in the Old Testament enjoined, and was never repealed. Ergo).

We answer, If the Ordinance of Children in Covenanting under the Law, was Circumcision, that Ordinance is repealed; Is not Circumcision repealed?

2. If you say notwithstanding, "Children of the Flesh, or the natural Seed, being once in the Covenant, and never cast out, (by reason that Law or Covenant, for their incovenanting being not repealed) is always in force.

Reply 1. That the Old or first Covenant, for their Incovenanting is repealed is plain; he took away the first, that he might establish the second.

2. Also 'tis said, that *Hagar* and her Son are cast out, *viz*, the legal Covenant, and fleshly Seed, and no new Law is added to bring them into the Gospel-Church by Baptism, i. e. the fleshly or natural Seed, as such. *Now is the Axe laid to the Root of the Tree.*

Fourthly; Your citing *Hab. 8.* and *Jer. 31.* to shew what Baptism seals to Infants, proves nothing. We deny not, but all who are actually in the New Covenant, *viz*, by Faith ingrafted into Christ, have right to Remission and Salvation; and that that Covenant secures and preserves them to Eternal Life; therefore the Children of Believers, as such, are not in it: And if they are no otherwise in it than conditionally, that is, if they repent, believe, &c. I ask you what Priviledge that is, more than what the Children of Heathens and Infidels have? for if they believe and repent, shall they not have the same Blessings & Priviledges of the Covenant also? As to the Adult Professors, we say, if they fall finally away, it shews they never indeed were in the Covenant of Grace. As to Adult true Believers, the Holy Spirit seals Remission and Salvation to them, and they shall be saved: a sign of what is actually in them, is held forth in Baptism, there being nothing signified by that Ordinance as to a Death unto Sin, but what they experienced wrought on their

their Souls before Baptized; tho, 'tis true, they thereby, for the time to come, covenant to walk in newness of Life.

Fifthly; As touching the great Commission, *Mat. 28.* where you urge Baptizing goes before Teaching, we have fully answered you in the precedent *Reply*; we prove, there is a Teaching goes before Baptism, and yet also a Teaching after. Why do you attempt to blind the Eyes of the unwary Reader?

Sixthly; To what purpose do you mention *Jairus's Daughter*? do we deny but that the Parents Faith and Prayer, may procure outward Blessings, nay, and spiritual Ones too; and as much perhaps for their poor carnal Neighbours and Friends? *My Servant Job shall pray for you.* The fervent Prayer of a Righteous Man availeth much, but it doth not give Right to their Friends or Children to Baptism.

Seventhly; As to your Syriac Translation, that the Jaylor and all the Sons of his House were Baptized: I argue, All his Sons, no doubt, were grown up to Age, because 'tis said, *he believed, with all his House.* If he had Sons grown up, and yet did not believe, then, by your Argument, Unbelievers may be Baptized; but so this see our Answer.

Eighthly; As to your proof from that Passage, *i. e. Suffer little Children to come unto me.* Take the words definitely or indefinitely, it proves nothing for you; for Christ Baptized no Child, for with his own Hands he Baptized no Person at all; *Job 4. 1, 2.* 'twas to lay his Hands upon them, not to Baptize them. Moreover, I have before told you, those little Ones, *Mark 9. 42.* were Adult, *Whosoever shall offend one of these little Ones that believe in me: I affirm, our Saviour speaks only of such little Ones as were grown up to such Age, as in very deed did believe in him, and not Babes of two or ten days old.* But, you say, you would have no Children profelyted, but such as *Timothy*, &c. To which you answer, That according to the Original, those Children that did *ex-teiv-ness*, which word we have shewed signifies any common coming, (and may be such who come in their Parents

Arms). Let Babes come to Christ, this way or that, he baptized none of them: I may infer as well, because little Children come or were brought to Christ, and of such are the Kingdom of Heaven; therefore they may partake of the Lord's Supper, as you infer they may be Baptized.

Ninthly; Tho the Gospel did not spread into all Nations, &c. yet sure you conclude all were to be baptized in all Nations wheresoever the Gospel did come, or was preached; or else, as we say, none in those Nations, but such who were made Disciples, *i. e. did believe and repent:* for if but some in those Nations where the Gospel comes, were to be Baptized, and not all, and yet more ought so to be; then such who are disciplined first: Pray who are they, or how shall we know them to be included in the Commission? For, as *Mr. Baxter* saith, If we have it not here, where have we it? this being the great Rule or Character of the Church for this Rite, unto which we ought to adhere in this Matter.

Tenthly; What signifies what some of the Ancient Fathers believed, *i. e. That Federal Holiness of Parents made Children Candidates for Baptism*? They said, other things too that you decri as well as we, many Errors being early let into the Church: Besides, we have *Tertullian* against *Tertullian*, or one Father against another, which is ground enough to believe you abuse *Tertullian*, or to doubt of the truth of your History.

Eleventhly; You ask whether Children have not as much right to their Baptism as that of Adult Females? for *tho no where said, she that believeth, and is baptized; where have we any Instance of Female-Baptism*?

Reply. We ask you whether Male and Female is not intended in *Mark 16. 16.* he or she? and so *John 3. 3.* *Unless a Man be born again; the Woman is included; or, have Women no Souls*? Did you never read of the Figure *Syllis*, or *Conceptus*, that comprehends the less worthy under the more worthy, *Indignus est sub digniori*? as for Example, *Quid tu & soror sanctis, ego & mater matri; primus tu & uxor qui adjungit tibi sibi?*

and

and it's no less true in Divinity; see that full and never to be baffled place, 1 Cor. 6. 14. *in No is origo, nisi.* See Gen. 5. 2. And he called their Name Adam, they two shall be one Flesh. Moreover, do we not read *Womans* were made Disciples as well as Men, and so had the same right to Baptism from the Commission?

But to detect your Ignorance of the Scripture, pray see Acts 8. 12. *When they believed Philip, preaching the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the Name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both Men and Women.* Also Acts 16. 15. 'tis said *Lydia* was baptized; I thought she had been a Woman. Gentlemen, you shew you are but younger Brethren, and will do the Pedobaptists no Service; shew such a Proof for the Baptism of Infants, and your work is done.

But tho Children lose no Spiritual Right by Christ's coming, yet they may lose some Legal Rites. As Ministers Sons now are not born to the Ministry, as they were under the Law, as well as their Fleshly Seed had right, as such, to their Jewish Church-Membership.

Furthermore; because Believers are made holy by the Operations of the Spirit, are all their Children made holy in like manner also? Blash for Christ's sake! The Blessing of Abraham, Sirs, only comes upon the Gentiles through Faith, not by natural Generation, as you imagine: As the Blessing runs to the Parents, viz. through Faith, so to their Children; they must believe also if they would be the Children of the Promise, or Spiritual Seed of Abraham, Gal. 3. ult.

Twelfthly; As touching what you say further, as to *universal Consent of the Ancient Churches*, it proves nothing. Should we believe your Histories, as firmly as we do believe there was an Alexander the Great, or a Cato, &c. if there is no Infant-Baptism in the Scripture, 'tis utterly gone: yet we challenge you to shew from Authentick History, that one Infant was baptized in the first or second Centuries, which we are not able to disprove by as good Authority.

Thirteenthly; If there was not a Congregation called Anabaptists till 300 Years after Christ,

it signifies nothing, as we have shewed. Moreover, we affirm, that all the Apostolical Primitive Churches were Baptists, i. e. such who only baptized Believers, and so continued till the Apostacy. See our further Answer to this to your first Mercury. We can prove there was a Testimony born against Infant-Baptism before 380 Years after Christ; nay, before the end of the third Century, See Tertul. in his Book *de Baptismo*, c. 18. who opposed Infant-Baptism, 1. From the mistake of that Text, Mat. 19. 14. *Suffer little Children to come unto me*; the Lord saith, says he, *do not forbid them to come unto me*; let them come, therefore when they grow elder, when they learn, when they are taught why they come, let them be made Christians when they can know Christ.

He adds six Arguments more; and to confirm this Testimony of Tertullian, see Dr. Barlow; saith he, *Tertullian dislikes and condemns Infant-Baptism as unwarrantable and irrational.*

Daille also saith, that Tertullian was of an Opinion, that Infants were not to be baptized; the like say divers others, as Mr. Darwents Shews, which his Opposers could not refute.

So that it appears you are ignorant both of Scripture and History too, and do but abuse your selves and the World also in this matter. Gentleman, you were better give over, than a fresh to blow up the Fire and Coal of Contention. You mistake in your third Column, we are not to prove a Negative, i. e. That no Infant was baptized in those Churches, you must prove they were.

Fourteen; Your Reply about our Saviour's not being baptized till thirty Years old, it was because he was a Jew, and profelyted Heathens were only baptized when young, is a Fig-leaf, still insinuating upon the old Jewish Custom; to which we have given you a full Answer.

Fifteen; What you say about dipping, and mention *ἐκ τῆς ὕδατος*, and that Authors shew that it signifies only, a bare and slight washing;

washing, and that plunging and washing are very distinct: This word comes from the same Verb you say signifies to dip or plunge. And whereas you hint, that *Beza* would have us baptize them, but not ~~them~~ them; you are resolved to prevent that danger, who only Sprinkle or Rantize them.

I affirm, Dipping or plunging, all learned in the Greek Tongue, and Criticks, do generally assert, is the literal, proper and genuine Signification of the word βαπτίζω; and if it any where refers to washing, 'tis to such a washing as is done by dipping or swelling in the Water: all sorts of washing are not distinct from dipping; and that βαπτίζω to baptize, is to wash, unless it be such a washing as is by dipping, we deny: is it not the same with ἵνα? also the Septuagint do render the word *Tabel* by βαπτίζω, and which all Translators, saith a good Author, both Latin, Dutch, Italian, French and English, do translate to dip, and always signifies to dip, as *Gen.* 37. 31. *Lev.* 4. 6. *Numb.* 15. 18. *2 Kings* 5. 14, &c.

Grotius saith it signifies to dip over Head and Ears.

Pasor, an Immersion, Dipping, or Submersion.

Light in his *Critica Sacra* saith, its native and proper Signification is to dip into the Water, or to plunge under the Water; and that it is taken from a *Dyers Vat*, and not a bare Washing only: See *Casaubon*, *Bucan*, *Bullinger*, *Zanchy*, *Beza*, &c.

To close; have we not cause to affirm you reproach us, to say our *Ring Leaders* come to ill Deaths. What signifies your Story of *John Bebold* of *Leyden*, and as if *Erasmus*, &c. had an ill Opinion of the *Anabaptists* of his time, does it follow you may vilify the Baptists of these times from thence? they might hold some Errors, and so may some so called now adays, as well as some *Pedo-*

Baptists, who are *Papists*, *Arians*, *Antitrinitarians*, *Socinians*, and what not; and some of them debauched Livers, and made as shameful Ends; these things cannot be unknown to you, but how base it is in you thus to write, let all sober Men judg. Your pretended Zeal will not acquit you from a slanderous Tongue, and speaking Evil of them you know not. Are not the *Papists* *Pedobaptists*, and some of the first and chief Assertors of it, and what an erroneous Crew are they? do you think we cannot parallel *John* of *Leyden* amongst some of the *Pedobaptists*. Were those Stories true of him and others? — are there not some bad Men of every Perswasion as well as good?

I exhort you to consider what account you will be able to give, for asserting Babies Rantism, or Infants Sprinkling, since 'tis not commanded of God, &c. in the dreadful Day of Judgment: or how dare you affirm we disturb the Church of Christ with false Doctrine, who assert, Believers only are the Subjects of Christ's true Baptism, and that Baptism is Immersion, i. e. Dipping, since both ties so plain in the Word of God? We fear not our appearing upon this account at Christ's Tribunal: And for all your great Confidence, your Practice we doubt not in the least will be found to be no Truth of the Gospel, but an unwarrantable Tradition. What tho *Sir Tho. More*, a *Papist*, was glad he had not profelyted Persons to his youthful Errors; must we therefore be afraid to promulgate a positive Truth of Christ?

Is it not said, This Sect is every-where spoken against?

If you had called for Syllogistical Arguments, you might have had them, but you ask for Queries; you may have Logical Arguments enow if you please, but you had better desist.

To conclude with your Postscript.

I Can't see Mr. Eliot has done the Pedo-Baptists any Service, or that any Honour redounds to him for that Work of his.

How in the Gospel-Church-State, the Promise runs to Believers and their Children, or Off-spring, we have shewed; And that Babes of two or ten Days old, are or can be said to be Disciples, is without proof and irrational: What though they may belong to the Kingdom of Heaven, or be saved, Baptism is of a meer positive Right: that Argument, I tell you again, will admit them to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as well as to Baptism. And as for Antiquity, we deny not but that it was received by divers as an Apostolical Tradition, a little time before *Naxianzen* or *Austin*; yet that it was preached as necessary to Salvation, before *Austin* did it, you can't prove, though we deny not but 'twas practised before *Austin's* Days. See Dr. Taylor, *Lib. Proph.* p. 237. "And the truth of the Business is, (*said he*) as there was no Command of Scripture to oblige Children to the susception of it; So the necessity of Pedo-Baptism was not determined in the Church till the Canon that was made in the *Milevatan* Council, a Provincial in *Africa*, never till then. I grant,

" (*said he*) it was practised in *Africa* before that time, and they, or some of them, thought well of it; and though that is no Argument for us to think so, yet none of them did ever pretend it to be necessary, nor to have been a Precept of the Gospel. *St. Austin* was the first that ever preached it to be necessary; and it was in his Heat and Anger against *Pelagius*, who had so warm'd and chased him, that made him innovate herein. Thus far the Doctor.

As to *Clemens*, *Irenaeus*, &c. you make such a stir about, is contradicted by History. *Clemens* asserts who are the right Subjects; and in what order they ought, after due Examinations and Instructions, to be baptized. See *Jacob Merminius*, in his History of Baptism, p. 2. upon *Cent. 2.* p. 209. out of *Clem. Epist. 3.* also Dutch *Martyrology*.

Ignatius, in his Discourse about Baptism, asserts, "That it ought to be accompanied with Faith, Love and Patience, after preaching; see *H. Montanus*, p. 45. and *Jacob Dubois*, p. 16, to 27. and Dutch *Martyrology*, where *Ignatius's* Letters are mentioned to *Polycarp Tralensis*, and to them of *Philadelphia*.

All that we can find of *Irenæus*, is, *Lib. 2. cap. 39. adv. Hæres.* " That Christ did sanctify every Age by his own susception of it, and similitude to it, all, I say, who by him are born again to God. In all which is no word of Infant-Baptism: Unless you wiredraw Consequences from his words, as you do from the Scripture, to support a tottering Structure, built on a false Foundation. That *Irenæus*, or any other but *Origen's* Testimony was in the case; You have *Dr. Taylor*, in his *Dissuasive against Popery*, p. 118, printed 1667, one of his last Pieces, saying thus, *viz.* " That there is a Tradition to baptize Infants, relies but upon two Witnesses, *Origen* and *Austin*; and the latter having received it from the former, it relies upon a single Testimony, which is but a pitiful Argument to prove a Tradition Apostolical: He is the first that spoke it, but *Tertullian*, that was before him, seems to speak against it, which he would not have done, if it had been a Tradition Apostolical; And that it was not so, is but too certain, if there be any Truth in the words of *Ludov. Vives*, saying, That anciently none were Baptized, but Persons of ripe Age.

And as to *Origen's* Works, there is cause to question, whether they are to be regarded? for *Mr. Perkins* and others doubt about them, because no Greek Copies thereof are extant. And *Dr. Taylor* saith, that many of his Works are Corrupt and Erroneous,

particularly in the Point of Baptism, and fell into ill Hands, &c.

To conclude, the Learned *Cure-laws*, *Instit. lib. 1. cap. 12.* thus saith, *Pædobaptismus duobus primis à Christo nato seculis fuit incognitus*, &c. *Pædo-Baptism* was unknown in the two first Ages after the Birth of Christ, but in the 3^d and 4th it was approved of by a few; in the 5th and the following Ages, it began to be generally received. And therefore (as afterward he saith) this Rite is indeed observed by us as an ancient Custom, but not as an Apostolical Tradition.

The same Author, *De peccato Originis*, *Numb. 56.* saith, *Morem Infantes baptizandi non cepisse ante tertium à Christo nato seculum*, &c. That the Custom of Baptizing Infants, did not begin till the 3^d Age after Christ; but in the two former, no footstep of it doth appear.

And afterward, (saith he) *Sine ipsius [Christi] mandato introducta est.* It was introduced without the Command of Christ.

Now let the Reader consider, if our Authority is not greater than the bare Testimony of *Zuinglius*, a late prejudiced Writer.

Gentlemen,

Many Eyes are upon you, and divers discreet Men think you have not done well, to reflect upon so great a Party of pious Christian-People; nor do

do they look on you as fit Persons to meddle with Sacred Things after this manner: They judg you are better skill'd to answer Love-stories, &c. than Points of Divinity. Certainly no wise Man can justify your Essay, to answer such Questions as concern this Controversy, &c. which tend to stir

up Strife and Contention among us; nor blame us to vindicate our Selves and Principle, when reproached and challenged after such a sort. But take your course, 'tis better to provoke to Love, Peace and Unity amongst one another.

F I N I S.

E R R A T A.

Page 3. line 8. for *it*, read *ix*. P. 3. l. 15. f. *Judicia*, r. *Judaica*. P. 5. l. 21. f. *Confessions*, r. *Considerations*. P. 6. l. 40. f. *Mede*, r. *Mood*, and l. 42. f. *Mede*, r. *Mood*; and col. 1. l. 8. f. *hu*, r. *for*. P. 7. l. 9. col. 2. f. *isvalid*, r. *isvalidated*. P. 10. col. 1. l. 8. f. *run*, r. *rums*, and col. 2. l. 31. f. *decides*, r. *decide*. P. 13. col. 2. l. 9. f. *childlist*, r. *childish*; and l. 22. f. *condemned*, r. *condema*. P. 15. col. 2. l. 36. f. *no where else*, r. *any where else*.